

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 10 to 21 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the acknowledgment that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

II. Rejection of Claims 10 to 12, 14, 15, 20, and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 10 to 12, 14, 15, 20, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,299,051 ("Tsuji") and U.S. Patent No. 6,326,717 ("Mattes"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Tsuji and Mattes does not render unpatentable the presently pending claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 10 relates to a friction-welding device for integrally joining components, each component including a welding surface, including, inter alia, the features of an oscillator, a compression device, and a cartridge adapted to accommodate the one of the components outside of a welding zone.

The combination of Tsuji and Mattes does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 10. For example, Tsuji merely indicates a sealing cap 1 and a substrate 2 between a base 9 and a bonding head 4. (Tsuji, col. 3, lines 30 to 50; and Figures 1 and 2). However, nowhere does Tsuji disclose a cartridge adapted to accommodate the one of the components outside of a welding zone. Instead, the bonding head 4 merely applies compressive force directly to the sealing cap 1. Therefore, Tsuji does not disclose, or even suggest, the feature of a cartridge adapted to accommodate a component outside of a welding zone, as provided for in the context of claim 10. Further, Mattes also does not disclose, or even suggest, the feature of a cartridge adapted to accommodate a component outside of a welding zone, and thus, fails to cure this critical deficiency.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Tsuji and Mattes does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 10. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Tsuji and Mattes

does not render unpatentable the presently pending claims for at least the foregoing reasons.

Thus, as for claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 20, and 21, which depend from and therefore include all of the features included in claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Tsujino and Mattes does not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the reasons more fully set forth above.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claim 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Tsujino, Mattes, U.S. Patent No. 6,617,766 ("Stoecklein et al."), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0086748 ("Culpepper"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Tsujino, Mattes, Stoecklein et al., and Culpepper does not render unpatentable the present claim for at least the following reasons.

Claim 13 depends from claim 10. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Tsujino and Mattes does not disclose, or even suggest, the feature of a cartridge adapted to accommodate components outside of a welding zone, as provided for in the context of claim 10. Stoecklein et al. and Culpepper also do not disclose, or even suggest, the feature of a cartridge adapted to accommodate components outside of a welding zone, and thus, fail to cure this critical deficiency.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Tsujino, Mattes, Stoecklein et al., and Culpepper does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 10, from which claim 13 depends. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Tsujino, Mattes, Stoecklein et al., and Culpepper does not render unpatentable claim 13, which depends from claim 10.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 16 and 18. Claim 16 has been rewritten in independent form

including all of the limitations of the base claim, thereby obviating the present objection with respect to claims 16 and 18.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 16 and 18 are allowable.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 4, 2008

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/
Clifford A. Ulrich
Reg. No. 42,194

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646